DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 122 837 IR 003 456

AUTHOR Schaffer, Dennis R.
TITLE Collective Bargaining and/or Instructional Development: A Question of Interdependence or Independence.
PUB DATE 29 Mar 76
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Association for Educational Communications and Technology Annual Meeting (Anaheim, California, March 29-April 2, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Collective Bargaining; *Educational Development; *Higher Education; *Instructional Design; *Instructional Innovation; Media Specialists; Surveys; Unions
IDENTIFIERS AECT 76

ABSTRACT

A survey explored the possibility that itemizations of such things as faculty workloads and faculty-student ratios in collective bargaining agreements may be inhibiting innovative instructional development. Members of the Division of Instructional Development of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) were questioned about collective bargaining as an independent or interdependent factor in instructional development. Results of the study indicated that collective bargaining has had a definite impact on instructional development, but that generalizations cannot yet be made on the positive or negative effects. Negotiation of release time, money, staff, and facilities for instructional development is possible. The individual instructional developer, however, must come to terms with collective bargaining or find himself negotiated out of the educational process. (LS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED122837

Collective Bargaining and/or Instructional Development: A Question of Interdependence or Independence

Dennis R. Schaffer
Instructional Development Consultant
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware 19711

AECT National Convention
Division for Instructional Development
Anaheim, California
March 29, 1976

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IR003456

Based upon their study for the Carnegie Commission, Ladd and Lipset (1976) found that an enormous potential existed for the further growth of faculty unions. By the beginning of 1976, about 95,000 faculty members out of over 600,000 were employed at unionized schools in America. Bargaining agents were selected to represent the faculties of 294 institutions with over 410 campuses. Opinion surveys indicated that faculty members were more disposed to accept collective bargaining and their number was growing steadily. When faculty were asked if a collective bargaining election was held at their institution, 72% indicated they would vote for a union. Ladd and Lipset concluded: "That unionization is the wave of academe's future" (p. 11).

During a faculty seminar at the University of Delaware, the merits of the audio-tutorial method were discussed. Benefits, such as being able to accommodate more students with less staff and to increase individual student contact with senior instructors, were challenged as possibly being in conflict with the collective bargaining agreement. The collective bargaining agreement at the University of Delaware (1975), Article XI, 11.4 states that "the planned student-bargaining unit faculty ration will not exceed 18.3 full-time graduate and undergraduate students per member of the bargaining unit in the University as a whole." The question that this incident raised was: If an innovate, instructional method can be challenged as being in conflict with negotiated articles of agreement, is not instructional development equally vulnerable?

Instructional development encourages an interdependent approach to instruction. Using a systematic approach, an instructional developer brings together instructional resources to achieve the maximum

educational impact. The balancing of these resources is many times only achieved by compromise, colleagueship, flexibility, and extra work. Sometimes this balancing is tenuous and subject to collapse from external forces. Is the collective bargaining agreement already asserting an adverse influence?

While instructional developers as Diamond are trying to depart from the "simplistic teacher/student ratio" (1974), collective bargaining agreements are stating specific teacher/student ratios. Diamond also believes that a need for the development of more flexibility and creativity in educational programs exists, but the collective bargaining agreements have defined workloads in terms of "past practices". As an example, Article XI, 11.2 of the University of Delaware's collective bargaining agreement (1975) states that "The composition of a normal workload within a unit will be consistent with past practice within that unit" (p. 14).

A persistent problem in higher education discussed by Ullmer and Stakenas (1971) is the traditional adherence to the lecture method. Conceivably, the only major "consistent with past practice" instructional technique in a department is the lecture. In addition, instructional development efforts at most campuses are of relatively recent origin, if they exist at all. The number of higher education institutions where instructional development is institutionalized to the extent that it would be under the "consistent with past practice" clause is probably small.

The preceding occurrences are a result of recent collective bargaining in higher education. These occurrences are representative of the two major trends identified by Mortimer and Lozier (1972): (1)

greater codification of faculty-administrative relations, procedures, and policies; and (2) the widening scope of subsequent collective bargaining contracts which after the initial contract may no longer be limited to terms and conditions of employment.

As the scope of subsequent contracts broadens, a faculty member's workload is becoming more minutely assigned with each subsequent collective bargaining contract. A recent analysis of collective bargaining agreements by Mortimer (1974) on faculty workload found such esoteric considerations as attendance at graduation ceremonies recorded under articles dealing with workload. Questions which this occurrence raises are: As the faculty member's workload is more minutely assigned will instructional development activities also have to be negotiated. In addition, will the flexibility needed during instructional development be lost to the tight confines of a collective bargaining agreement with specific time allocations for instructional efforts.

Numerous questions can be raised as to the potential impact of collective bargaining upon instructional development. This study has attempted to determine what has been the actual impact by surveying members of the Division of Instructional Development (DID) of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology. It was believed that by surveying the DID's membership's experiences with collective bargaining that a better understanding could be reached as to the past, present, and future effects of collective bargaining upon instructional development. The central issue that collective bargaining raises for the Division of Instructional Development is: will collective bargaining assume a more independent or interdependent role with instructional development.

Sample

In order to study this issue, a survey with questions about collective bargaining and instructional development was prepared with input from various officers and members of the DID. A random sample of 197 DID members was drawn. Approximately 29% of the total membership of the DID were surveyed by questionnaire. Two mailings were done and realized an approximate return of 59% (N=166) from the division members. Due to no forwarding address, 8% of questionnaires were returned by the post office. There is no reason to believe that 33% of nonrespondents are an atypical group. As in the case of Hoban's study (1974), it is probable that nonrespondents are not primarily engaged in the field of instructional development. For analysis, the primary roles of the DID members were consolidated into three categories with the respective response rates of Instructional Developer (33%), Administrator (40%), and Teacher (27%). The author recommends the usual caution for the reader in accepting the author's conclusion and the reader drawing his own generalizations from the data.

Demographic Characteristics and Results

Age, sex, union membership, type of institution, and manner of union representation at the institution were thought to be important for describing the Division for Instructional Development's membership. The statistically average respondent was (Table 1): male (78%), between 31 and 50 (62%), with neither present nor past union membership (67%), at a public (83%) institution of higher education (71%), with some manner of union representation (46%). A comparison to Hoban's study (1974) of instructional developers noted a trend toward younger developers. Hoban

found the majority (54%) of the DID members 41 years and older, while this study found 53% between 20 and 40. More females have also joined the DID (from 9% in 1973 to 22% in 1975). Both studies found college campuses dominating the locale of the members (approximately 76%). Less minor differences, the author assumed that Hoban's description of instructional developers was applicable to this study.

Insert Table 1 about here

It was noted that DID members (46%) were located at institutions with union representation. Considering that 16% of higher education institutions have union representation, it seemed that collective bargaining was very close to home for most DID members. Unions were perceived by a majority of the DID members to be moderately (60%) to very (21%) valuable in our society (Table 2). Though members believe faculty should be allowed to unionize (85%) and strike (61%), only 38% would actually support a strike by faculty. These findings were similar to the Ladd and Lipset study of faculty which found a surprising amount of support for collective bargaining. The low rate of support for a strike probably can be explained because it is easier to abstractly support collective bargaining than to actually man the picket lines.

Insert Table 2 about here

When asked what effect collective bargaining would have upon the quality of instruction, DID members were not convinced that quality

would improve. Only 9% thought instruction would be improved while 25% believed that collective bargaining would erode quality and 30% did not know the outcome.

Responding to trends noted in the research literature on collective bargaining (Table 3), 59% found no trend towards subsequent collective bargaining contracts widening the scope of issues negotiated from salary and workload concerns. Also, no trend was noted by 47% in an increase of specific rules regarding faculty and administrative relations, procedures, and policies in collective bargaining agreements. Though the respondents noted none of the trends, they viewed these trends as having a potential negative effect upon instructional development efforts if they would occur.

Insert Table 3 about here

Table 4 shows two interesting results. First, there are attempts being made to negotiate provisions for release time, money, staff and facilities for instructional development. This finding is consistent with a national trend towards a widening scope of issues emerging after the first contract.

Second, responding to whether instructional development will be adversely affected by collective bargaining, 29% did not know. Apparently, many DID members are not sure as to the potential impact on instructional development of the various issues surrounding collective bargaining. According to the results, instructional developers are more optimistic than teachers.

Insert Table 4 about here

Discussion

At this time, it is difficult to fully estimate the implications of collective bargaining upon instructional development. It is evident from the research literature that there will be major changes within any institution which selects a bargaining agent. According to 72% of the respondents to this study, implications of these changes on instructional development must be the concern of everyone engaged in the improvement of instruction. Though an overall analysis of the results of this study does not indicate any past or present major problems for instructional development, it is evident that the potential exists.

Of course the selection of a collective bargaining agent at a college is not in itself a harbinger of doom for instructional development. The collective bargaining process can also offer an opportunity for greater implementation of instructional development. Provisions for release time, money, staff, and facilities for instructional development could be negotiated as easily as the more esoteric items.

This brings us back to the central issue that collective bargaining raises for the LID: will collective bargaining assume a more independent or interdependent role with instructional development. Since the ramifications of collective bargaining in education are as numerous as the permutations of the different types of institutions, faculty, and social conditions that exist, generalizations are difficult

at this time. But the obvious results of past collective bargaining activities will be future major changes in faculty-administrative relations, terms and conditions of employment, and governance.

An instructional developer can not independently operate nor control these influences. The individual instructional developer in each institution is going to have to come to terms with collective bargaining. For if he fails to appreciate the implications of collective bargaining upon instructional development, he may find himself negotiated out of the educational process.

REFERENCES

Collective Bargaining Agreement--University of Delaware and American Association of University Professors, University of Delaware Chapter. Newark, Delaware: September 5, 1975.

Diamond, Robert M., Telephone interview, 1974. Cited by James E. Holsclaw, The development of procedural guidelines for the systematic design of instruction within higher education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1974.

Diamond, Robert M.; Eickmann, Paul E.; Kelly, Edward F.; Holloway, Robert E.; Vickery, Tom Rusk; and Pascarella, Ernest T. Instructional Development in Higher Education. Syracuse, New York: Center for Instructional Development, 1973.

Hoban, D. The instructional developer. AV Communication Review, 1974, 22, 453-466.

Ladd, E. C. and Lipset, S. M. The growth of faculty unions. The Chronicle of Higher Education, January 26, 1976, 11.

Mortimer, Kenneth P. and Lozier, G. Gregory. Faculty Workload and Collective Bargaining. July, 1974, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania.

Mortimer, Kenneth P. and Lozier, G. Gregory. Collective Bargaining: Implications for Governance. Report No. 17, June, 1972, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania.

Ullmer, Eldon J., with Stakenas, Robert G. Instructional Development Handbook. Tallahassee, Florida: Division of Instructional Research and Service, Florida State University, 1971.

Table 1

Responses in Percentages* to Questionnaire Items on Collective Bargaining by Instructional Developers (ID), Administrators (ADM), Teachers (TEACH), and ID, ADM, AND TEACH combined (ALL)

Item	Group			
	ALL	ID	ADM	TEACH
Age:				
20-30	17	21	20	9
31-40	36	45	30	34
41-50	26	11	30	38
51-60	14	11	17	13
Over 60	7	13	2	6
Sex:				
Male	78	79	78	78
Female	22	21	22	22
Type of institution:				
Public	83	79	80	91
Independent/Denominational/ Non-degree Granting	17	21	19	--
Highest degree offered:				
Certificate/Diploma/None	11	19	9	0
AA	8	0	20	6
BA/BS; MA/MS; and PhD/EdD	63	79	70	87
Present or past active membership of any union:				
Yes	32	29	33	34
No	67	68	67	66

Table 1--Continued

Item	Group			
	ALL	ID	ADM	TEACH
Collective bargaining agency representing the faculty:				
None	44	39	48	44
AAUP, NEA, AFT, AFL-CIO, Local	46	45	46	50
Don't Know	8	11	7	6

*Percentages do not total 100%, since 'no response' category has not been included for table brevity.

Table 2

Responses in Percentages* to Questionnaire Items on Collective Bargaining by Instructional Developers (ID), Administrators (ADM), Teachers (TEACH), and ID, ADM, AND TEACH combined (ALL)

Item	Group			
	ALL	ID	ADM	TEACH
Overall evaluation of the value of unions in our society:				
Little Value	10	8	11	13
Moderate Value	60	63	61	56
Very Valuable	21	26	22	13
Don't Know	6	3	4	13
If faculty should be allowed to unionize:				
Yes	85	89	85	81
No	10	11	7	16
Don't Know	3	0	4	3
If faculty should be allowed to strike:				
Yes	61	63	57	66
No	27	24	30	25
Don't Know	11	13	11	9
No Response	1	0	2	0
Support a strike by faculty:				
Yes	38	47	35	31
No	35	24	39	44
Don't Know	22	29	15	25

Table 2--Continued

Item	Group			
	ALL	ID	ADM	TEACH
Effect collective bargaining will have upon the quality of instruction:				
Improve Quality	9	8	7	16
Remain the Same	31	32	33	28
Erode Quality in Education	25	21	30	22
Don't Know	30	37	22	34

*Percentages do not total 100%, since 'no response' category has not been included for table brevity.

Table 3

Responses in Percentages* to Questionnaire Items on Collective Bargaining by Instructional Developers (ID), Administrators (ADM), Teachers (TEACH), and ID, ADM, AND TEACH combined (ALL)

Item	Group			
	ALL	ID	ADM	TEACH
The extent that as subsequent collective bargaining contracts are negotiated, a widening scope of issues emerge and negotiations not limited to salary and workload concerns.				
Extensive Occurences	9	11	7	9
Some Occurences	22	26	22	16
No Trend Noted	59	53	59	66
The extent of increase in specific rules regarding faculty and administrative relations, procedures, and policies in collective bargaining agreements.				
Extensive Occurences	12	13	13	9
Some Occurences	28	39	22	25
No Trend Noted	47	39	46	56
Effect of the widening scope of subsequent contracts upon instructional development.				
Positive Effect	23	21	22	28
No Effect	11	11	17	3
Negative Effect	41	37	43	41
Don't Know	22	32	15	22

Table 3--Continued

Item	Group			
	ALL	ID	ADM	TEACH
Effect of an increase of specific rules and policies upon instructional development.				
Positive Effect	17	21	11	22
No Effect	9	8	15	3
Negative Effect	38	37	37	41
Don't Know	26	29	24	25

*Percentages do not total 100%, since 'no response' category has not been included for table brevity.

Table 4

Responses in Percentages* to Questionnaire Items on Collective Bargaining by Instructional Developers (ID), Administrators (ADM), Teachers (TEACH), and ID, ADM, AND TEACH combined (ALL)

Item	Group			
	ALL	ID	ADM	TEACH
Attempts through collective bargaining to negotiate provisions for release time, money, staff and facilities for instructional development.				
No Attempts	54	61	52	50
Some Attempts	28	29	28	28
Extensive Attempts	2	0	0	6
Belief that instructional development will be adversely affected by collective bargaining.				
Yes	34	26	33	44
No	30	39	28	22
Don't Know	29	34	30	22

*Percentages do not total 100%, since 'no response' category has not been included for table brevity.